1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332) United States Attorney	
2	BRIAN STRETCH (CSBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division	
4 5	DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055)
6 7	San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7359 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 denise.barton@usdoj.gov	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13		
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CR No. 08-0329 JSW
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JULY 3, 2008
16	v.	THROUGH JULY 31, 2008
17	TIMOTHY CRAIG,	
18	Defendant.	
19	Soromann	
20		
21	On July 3, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time	
22	should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from July 3, 2008 through July 31,	
23	2008. The parties represented that granting the continuance was necessary for continuity of	
24	counsel and effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, in	
25	light of defense counsel's work travel schedule and to afford defense counsel time to prepare	
26	motions he intends to file. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties further represented	
27		
28		

1	that the Speedy Trial Act would be tolled by statute upon filing of motions by the defendant on	
2	July 31, 2008. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(F).	
3		
4	SO STIPULATED:	
5		
6	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO	
7	United States Attorney	
8		
9	DATED: July 3, 2008 /s/ Denise Barton	
10	DENISE MARIE BARTON Assistant United States Attorney	
11		
12	DATED: July 3, 2008 /s/ STEVEN G. KALAR	
13	Attorney for TIMOTHY CRAIG	
14		
15	As the Court found on July 3, 2008, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the	
16	ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the	
17	defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act	
18	calculations from July 3, 2008 through July 31, 2008. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of	
19		
20		
21	justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).	
22		
23	SO ORDERED.	
24		
25 26	DATED: July 7, 2008 HONGO AD E 11GEDEN WHITE	
26 27	United States District Court Judge	
28		